



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/743,243	12/22/2003	Harald van Kampen	Kampen 2-15	6964
46900	7590	06/26/2006	EXAMINER	
MENDELSON & ASSOCIATES, P.C. 1500 JOHN F. KENNEDY BLVD., SUITE 405 PHILADELPHIA, PA 19102			SAMS, MATTHEW C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2617	

DATE MAILED: 06/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/743,243	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KAMPEN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Matthew C. Sams	<b>Art Unit</b> 2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 March 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Amendment***

1. This office action has been changed in response to the amendment filed on 3/15/2006.
2. The Art Unit location of your application in the USPTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Art Unit 2617.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-9, 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lindskog et al. (US 2002/0132603 hereafter, Lindskog).
5. Regarding claim 1, Lindskog teaches WLAN system with stations that operate in awake and doze states comprising a station in the awake state and an access point (AP) of the system informed that the station is in the awake state, transmitting to the AP a closing frame, wherein a designated bit in the closing frame informs the AP that the station will transition to the doze state (Page 2 [0024-0025] & Page 3 [0050-0055]), where:

(A) comprises starting a timer and transmitting the closing frame after the timer reaches a threshold value (Page 4 [0071-0072] and Fig. 2)

(B) transitioning the station from the awake state to the doze state based on the transmission of the closing frame. (Fig. 2 [active & sleep] and Page 3 [0050-0055])

Regarding claim 2, Lindskog teaches the contention-based WLAN system conforms to an IEEE 802.11 standard. (Page 1 [0002 & 0007] & Page 3 [0051])

Regarding claim 3, Lindskog teaches the contention-based WLAN system conforms to an extension of the IEEE 802.11 standard. (Page 1 [0002 & 0007] & Page 3 [0051])

Regarding claim 4, Lindskog teaches steps A & B are performed independent of any beacon schedule for the system. (Page 1 [0015] & Page 4 [0071-0083])

Regarding claim 5, Lindskog teaches receiving from the AP an acknowledgment frame corresponding to the closing frame. (Fig. 2 [Sleep Res])

Regarding claim 6, Lindskog teaches the designated bit is a power management bit of an IEEE 802.11 standard. (Page 2 [0025-0026])

Regarding claim 7, Lindskog inherently teaches receiving a data frame from the AP and transmitting the closing frame in response to the received data frame since the station can send a request to sleep asynchronously. (Page 1 [0015] & Fig. 2)

Regarding claim 8, Lindskog inherently teaches the closing frame is an acknowledgement frame corresponding to the last data frame since the station would not be transitioning to a sleep state if there were more data frames to receive. (Page 3 [0050-0055])

Regarding claim 9, Lindskog teaches a null frame can be sent by the station.  
(Page 3 [0061])

Regarding claim 26, the limitations of claim 26 are rejected as being the same reason set forth above in claim 1.

Regarding claim 27, the limitations of claim 27 are rejected as being the same reason set forth above in claim 1.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 10-25 and 28-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lindskog in view of Meier et al. (US 2005/0018624 hereafter, Meier).

Regarding claim 10, Lindskog teaches the limitations of claim 1, but differs from the claimed invention by not explicitly reciting the designated bit is a more data bit of an IEEE 802.11 standard.

In an analogous art, Meier teaches a power save method for 802.11E stations wherein the designated bit is a more data bit of an IEEE 802.11 standard. (Meier Page 6 [0089-0091]) At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the invention of Lindskog after modifying it incorporate the data bit of Meier. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been

motivated to do this since only a certain bit has to be used to transition into a sleep state.

Regarding claim 11, Lindskog in view of Meier teaches the closing frame is a data frame and step A comprises receiving from the AP an acknowledgment frame corresponding to the closing frame. (Lindskog Page 3 [0050-0055] and Meier Page 6 [0089-0091])

Regarding claim 12, Lindskog in view of Meier teaches that step A comprises receiving a first data frame from the AP, wherein a designated bit in the first data frame informs the station whether the AP has further data to transmit to the station. (Meier Fig. 3 and Page 4 [0059])

Regarding claim 13, Lindskog in view of Meier teaches the designated bit in the first data frame informs the station that the AP has further data (Meier Page 4 [0059]), the station transmits an acknowledgment frame corresponding to the first data frame, wherein a designated bit in the acknowledgment frame informs the AP that the station will remain in the awake state and be available to receive at least one further transmission from the AP. (Lindskog Page 3 [0055] e.g. the NIC may refuse a transition to enter D1, D2 or D3)

Regarding claim 14, Lindskog in view of Meier teaches receiving a second data frame from the AP, wherein the designated bit in the second data frame informs the station whether the AP has further data to transmit to the station. (Meier Page 4 [0059-0061])

Regarding claim 15, Lindskog in view of Meier teaches the designated bit in the first data frame informs the station that the AP has further data, the station transmits the closing frame. (Lindskog Page 1 [0015] e.g. asynchronous and Page 4 [0080])

Regarding claim 16, Lindskog in view of Meier teaches with the station in the doze state, transitioning the station from the doze state to the awake state and transmitting to the AP a first frame, wherein a designated bit in the first frame informs the AP that the station will remain in the awake state and be available to receive at least one transmission from the AP. (Lindskog Page 3 [0055] and Meier Page 4 [0059])

Regarding claim 17, Lindskog in view of Meier teaches an AP of a contention-based WLAN system in which a station is adapted to operate in awake and doze states comprising

(A) with the station in the awake state and the AP informed that the station is in the awake state, receiving from the station a closing frame, wherein a designated bit in the closing frame informs the AP that the station will transition to the doze state based on the transmission of the closing frame to the AP, wherein the closing frame is transmitted by the station in response to a timer reaching a threshold value (Lindskog Page 4 [0071-0072], Fig. 2 [active & sleep] and Page 3 [0050-0055]) and;

(B) refraining from transmitting frames to the station until a notification is received that the station is in the awake state. (Meier Page 2 [0022])

Regarding claim 18, Lindskog in view of Meier teaches the contention-based WLAN system conforms to an IEEE 802.11 standard. (Lindskog Page 1 [0002 & 0007] & Page 3 [0051])

Regarding claim 19, Lindskog in view of Meier teaches the contention-based WLAN system conforms to an extension of the IEEE 802.11 standard. (Lindskog Page 1 [0002 & 0007] & Page 3 [0051])

Regarding claim 20, Lindskog in view of Meier teaches steps A & B are performed independent of any beacon schedule for the system. (Lindskog Page 1 [0015] & Page 4 [0071-0083])

Regarding claim 21, Lindskog in view of Meier teaches the closing frame is a data frame and step A comprises receiving from the AP an acknowledgment frame corresponding to the closing frame. (Lindskog Page 3 [0050-0055] and Meier Page 6 [0089-0091])

Regarding claim 22, the limitations of claim 22 are rejected as being the same reason set forth above in claim 12.

Regarding claim 23, the limitations of claim 23 are rejected as being the same reason set forth above in claim 13.

Regarding claim 24, the limitations of claim 24 are rejected as being the same reason set forth above in claim 14.

Regarding claim 25, the limitations of claim 25 are rejected as being the same reason set forth above in claim 15.

Regarding claim 28, the limitations of claim 28 are rejected as being the same reason set forth above in claim 17.

Regarding claim 29, the limitations of claim 29 are rejected as being the same reason set forth above in claim 17.



Regarding claim 30, Lindskog in view of Meier teaches a station of a contention based WLAN system in which the station is adapted to operate in awake and doze states comprising,

(A) with the station in the awake state and an AP of the system informed that the station is in the awake state, transmitting to the AP a closing frame, wherein a designated bit in the closing frame informs the AP that the station will transition to the doze state (Lindskog Page 2 [0024-0025] & Page 3 [0050-0055]) and

(B) transitioning the station from the awake state to the doze state, wherein step (A) comprises:

receiving a first data frame from the AP, wherein a designated bit in the first data frame informs the station whether the AP has further data to transmit to the station (Meier Fig. 3 and Page 4 [0059]), wherein, when the designated bit in the first data frame informs the station that the AP has further data, the station transmits an acknowledgment frame corresponding to the first data frame, wherein a designated bit in the acknowledgment frame informs the AP that the station will remain in the awake state and be available to receive at least on further transmission from the AP (Lindskog Page 3 [0055] and Meier Page 4 [0059]) and

receiving a second data frame from the AP, wherein a designated bit in the second data frame informs the station whether the AP has further data to transmit to the station. (Meier Page 4 [0059-0061])

Regarding claim 31, Lindskog in view of Meier teaches a method in which a station is adapted to operating in awake and doze states in a WLAN system comprising

(A) with the station in the awake state and an AP of the system informed that the station is in the awake state, transmitting to the AP a closing frame, wherein a designated bit in the closing frame informs the AP that the station will transition to the doze state (Lindskog Page 2 [0024-0025] & Page 3 [0050-0055]) and

(B) transitioning the station from the awake state to the doze state, wherein step (A) comprises receiving a first data frame from the AP, wherein a designated bit in the first data frame informs the station whether the AP has further data to transmit to the station and, when the designated bit in the first data frame informs the station that the AP has further data, the station transmits the closing frame. (Lindskog Page 1 [0015] *e.g.* asynchronous, Page 4 [0080] and Meier Page 4 [0059-0061])

Regarding claim 32, Lindskog in view of Meier teaches a method in which a station is adapted to operating in awake and doze states in a WLAN system comprising:

(A) with the station in the awake state and an AP of the system informed that the station is in the awake state, receiving at the AP a closing frame, wherein a designated bit in the closing frame informs the AP that the station will transition to the doze state (Lindskog Page 2 [0024-0025] & Page 3 [0050-0055]) and

(B) refraining from transmitting frames to the station until a notification is received that the station is in the awake state (Meier Page 2 [0022]), wherein step (A) comprises:

transmitting a first data frame to the station, wherein a designated bit in the first data frame informs the station whether the AP has further data to transmit to the station (Meier Fig. 3 and Page 4 [0059]), wherein, when the designated bit in the first data frame informs the station that the AP has further data, the station transmits an acknowledgment frame corresponding to the first data frame, wherein a designated bit

in the acknowledgment frame informs the AP that the station will remain in the awake state and be available to receive at least on further transmission from the AP (Lindskog Page 3 [0055] and Meier Page 4 [0059]) and

transmitting a second data frame to the station, wherein a designated bit in the second data frame informs the station whether the AP has further data to transmit to the station. (Meier Page 4 [0059-0061])

Regarding claim 33, Lindskog in view of Meier teaches a method in which a station is adapted to operating in awake and doze states in a WLAN system comprising

(A) with the station in the awake state and an AP of the system informed that the station is in the awake state, receiving from the station a closing frame, wherein a designated bit in the closing frame informs the AP that the station will transition to the doze state (Lindskog Page 2 [0024-0025] & Page 3 [0050-0055]) and

(B) refraining from transmitting frames to the station until a notification is received that the station is in the awake state (Meier Page 2 [0022]), wherein step (A) comprises:

transmitting a first data frame to the station, wherein a designated bit in the first data frame informs the station whether the AP has further data to transmit to the station (Meier Fig. 3 and Page 4 [0059]) and, when the designated bit in the first data frame informs the station that the AP has further data, the station transmits the closing frame. (Lindskog Page 1 [0015] e.g. asynchronous, Page 4 [0080] and Meier Page 4 [0059-0061])

***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew C. Sams whose telephone number is (571)272-8099. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lester Kincaid can be reached on (571)272-7922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MCS  
6/19/2006

  
LESTER G. KINCAID  
SUPERVISORY PRIMARY EXAMINER